



13 SEP 2006

Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar, LLC
5 Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840

In re Application of	:	
TANIR et al.	:	
U.S. Application No. 10/523,222	:	
PCT No.: PCT/GB03/03355	:	
It. Filing Date: 01 August 2003	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Priority Date: 01 August 2002	:	
Attorney Docket No.: S18.001	:	
For: SPECTACLE KIT	:	

This decision is issued in response to "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) to Accept Application with Missing Signature" filed 30 June 2006 to accept the application without the signature of joint inventor, Paul Davey Sinding.

BACKGROUND

On 01 August 2003, applicants filed international application PCT/GB03/03355 which claimed a priority date of 01 August 2002. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.495, the deadline for payment of the basic national fee in the United States was to expire 30 months from the priority date, 01 February 2004.

On 31 January 2005, applicants filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1); a copy of the international application; and a copy of the international search report.

On 17 August 2005, the United States Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed. The notification set a two-month time limit in which to respond.

On 20 January 2006, applicants filed a petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) and the requisite petition fee for a three-month extension of time. In a decision dated 27 April 2006, applicants' renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) was dismissed without prejudice.

On 30 June 2006, applicants filed the present renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17, (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the nonsigning joint inventor. Items (1), (3) and (4) have been satisfied.

As to item (2), petitioner states that Paul Davey Sinding cannot be found or reached after diligent effort. Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

Where inability to find or reach a nonsigning inventor "after diligent effort" is the reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47, a statement of facts should be submitted that fully describes the exact facts which are relied on to establish that a diligent effort was made.

The fact that a nonsigning inventor is on vacation or out of town and is therefore temporarily unavailable to sign the declaration is not an acceptable reason for filing under 37 CFR 1.47.

The statement of facts must be signed, where at all possible, by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts recited therein. Statements based on hearsay will not normally be accepted. Copies of documentary evidence such as internet searches, certified mail return receipts, cover letters of instructions, telegrams, that support a finding that the nonsigning inventor could not be found or reached should be made part of the statement. The steps taken to locate the whereabouts of the nonsigning inventor should be included statement of facts. It is important that the statement contain facts as opposed to conclusions.

A review of the present petition reveals that petitioner has not provided an acceptable showing that a diligent effort was made to locate the nonsigning inventor, Paul Davey Sinding. The declaration of Erol Tanir states "that joint inventor Paul Sinding cannot be reached after diligent effort. . ." However, no documentary evidence to support Mr. Tanir's assertion has been provided with the petition. Further, the declaration fails to include evidence to determine the possible whereabouts of the missing inventor. In this case, a diligent effort may be a search of Internet and/or telephone directories to determine if Davey Sinding has a forwarding address and/or telephone number. Applicants are reminded that documentary evidence of the internet searches, certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instructions, telegrams, etc., should be supplied by a person having firsthand knowledge of the facts.

For the reasons stated above, it would not be appropriate to accept the application without the signature of Paul Davey Sinding under 37 CFR 1.47(a) at this time.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTH** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to: Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.



Anthony Smith
Attorney-Advisor
Office of PCT Legal Administration
Tel.: (571) 272-3298
Fax: (571) 273-0459